



Seat Management Workgroup

Minutes

Department of Information Technology

3rd Floor Executive Conference Room

(Richmond Plaza Building, 7th Street entrance, Richmond)

March 26, 2001

2:00 pm- 3:30 pm

ATTENDANCE

Members Present:

Laverne Branch (DGS); Joshua Heslinga (College of W&M); Steve Kelliher (VDOT); Naseem Reza (VSP); Wayne Stafford (DOC); George Williams (UVA).

Presenters, Guests, Staff and Representatives Present:

Robert Crigler (GTSI); Curt Diemer (SMS); Don Fraser (DynCorp); John Hagerty (Compaq); Ron Keister (GMU); John Panko (Halifax); Constance Scott (eGov – SMS); John Sheldon (Supreme Court of VA); Chuck Tyger (SMS); Bruce Wine (Dell).

Members Absent:

Ed Ernouf (PDC); Ken Mittendorff (SC); Keith Segerson (GMU) Pete Stamps (Lottery); Rick Wilhelm (Fairfax County).

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Wayne Stafford, Chairman of the Seat Management Workgroup, convened the meeting at 2:05p.m.

MEETING OBJECTIVES

Presentation of Request for Change to Seat Management Packages to Seat Management Section of the E-Government Implementation Division

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the 2-23-2001 meeting were approved.

STATUS OF PREVIOUS ACTION ITEMS

Seat Management continues to market TCO and Seat Management services and finalize a business plan.

SEAT MANAGEMENT CHANGE CONTROL PROCEDURE WORKGROUP REPORT

Discussion

Chairman Wayne Stafford discussed the change control process procedure ([Attachment 1](#)), which was distributed. A motion to accept the process passed unanimously

Action Items

The approved change control procedure will be passed on to the COTS Executive Director.

REQUESTS FOR CONTRACT CHANGES WORKGROUP REPORT

Discussion

Steve Kelliher summarized the work of the workgroup on contract changes and the requests for specific changes to the S.M.A.R.T. contracts. He then distributed his letter addressed to the chairman outlining a recommended broader approach, which would allow the agencies and vendors more flexibility than the current contract allows. Specifically, the letter raised the issue of brand name machine restrictions and the need for additional services not allowed by the current contract ([Attachment 2](#) as amended).

After much discussion regarding the risks of broadening the current scope of the contract beyond its original intent, a motion to accept the letter/report and concurrence that this was the general sense of the entire Seat Management Workgroup was approved by the members with one abstention. A technical amendment to the letter was accepted regarding procurement language.

Action Items

The letter as amended will be passed on to the COTS Executive Director.

TCO SERVICES MINIMUM METRICS WORKGROUP REPORT

Discussion

George Williams discussed the work of the TCO Services Metrics workgroup. He distributed worksheet 4 regarding agency inventory metrics and worksheet 5 regarding TCO Best Practices metrics ([Attachment 3](#) and [4](#)).

General discussion took place but a decision to accept the minimum metrics recommendations of the workgroup was postponed until the members had additional time to study the worksheets.

Action Items

Members will study the worksheets and be prepared to discuss and act on the workgroup recommendation at the next meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Discussion

Constance Scott presented two questions posed on Friday regarding OEM partners and service matrix

inclusion of all services and the level field for vendors.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

NEXT MEETING

April 23, 2:00 – 3:30 DIT

Respectfully Submitted,

Curt Diemer

Electronic Government Implementation Division

Seat Management Section

Attachment 1

Seat Management Contract Change Control Process

Agency submits written questions or change requests in the form of requirements to the Seat Management Section (SMS) of E-Gov.

- Questions relative to the Seat Management contract will be researched and answered in writing by SMS. Where appropriate, the question and answer will be posted under frequently asked questions on the Seat Management website.
- Requests for change will be logged by SMS, reviewed*, and forwarded to the Chair of the COTS Seat Management Contract Amendments Committee.

The Seat Management Contract Amendments (SMCA) Committee reviews the request; translates the business requirements into technical requirements; evaluates the request in terms of desirability and scope of impact; and formulates a recommendation to the Seat Management Workgroup for action.

Based upon actions taken by the Seat Management Workgroup, the Seat Management Section of E-Gov will take appropriate action to implement those recommendations. Appropriate actions could include seeking advice from the Department of General Services and the Attorney General's Office, and as appropriate sending new and/or revised requirements for Seat Management Services contract modifications to Acquisitions Services Division (ASD) for processing. (ASD will process requests in the order received unless otherwise directed by SMS.)

*Reviewed – SMS will review request for content. SMS may call requestor for additional information. SMS may engage other resources for input. SMS Workgroup Chair will authorize/approve request for

submission to SMCA Committee.

Attachment 2
COTS Seat Management Workgroup
Contract Modification Sub-Committee

May 1, 2001

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I have noticed through discussions with people from various state agencies and through the requests coming through this committee, that there seems to be a fundamental flaw in the existing state contract for Seat Management. The contract is supposed to be a services contract. The expectation is that the vendors will provide solutions in the area of desktop services. The reality is that the contract is merely a procurement vehicle for a 'one size fits all' PC complete with maintenance. The "service" part comes into play only if you agree to lease the PC. And the services, while robust, are not inviting enough to convince agencies to settle on the limited choice of PCs.

I understand the role of the Workgroup to be one of promoting Seat Management and smoothing the way for agencies to feel comfortable in participating. The basic idea is sound and worthwhile, but the implementation is lacking. My fear is that the vendors will pull out before the first agency signs up. The simple fact is that the contract, as it is today, is too constrictive and agencies see that and are backing off.

We can address the same issues over and over again by recommending specific contract modifications one by one. Or, we can look at this in a larger perspective and see if we can solve many of these issues at one time. I'd like to recommend that we address the larger perspective.

First, the vendor(s) should not be limited to one or two manufacturers or brand offerings. Next, they should not be limited to a one-size-fits-all approach. They should take our requirements; seek to find the best, most cost effective solutions within the parameters they deem as competitive; and return to the COV with solutions that meet our needs. That is where the greatest service is provided. The agency experts evaluating the proposed solutions should be empowered to decide if the proposed solution is cost effective and meets the needs of the agency. They are today and there is no mandate to remove that power from them.

This contract cannot be a cookie-cutter approach to Seat Management. There are simply too many differences even within an agency. For example, the ABC Department's request to be able to put their 'seats' under this program. They have 750 'seats' that do not conform to the 'cookie-cutter' version from which they had to choose. Their 'seats' are in fact Point of Sale (POS) devices, or PCs with specific types of peripherals attached. They are not the only agency that will have the same need – Corrections,

DMV, and several others use POS devices within those agencies. These same agencies will need the more traditional PCs as well, but they want one supplier. Why not, when the idea is service? Going to the SM vendor for both of these needs is where the service comes in to the picture.

The vendor, when seeking out the best, most cost effective solution, should not be limited to one or two manufacturers or brands. The technology changes too fast, and the vendor should be able to provide the COV the service even if it means selecting a different manufacturer's goods. After all, this is not a hardware procurement contract, so why should it matter what manufacturer or brand the vendor offers. However, it may matter to an agency, which had already invested large sums of time, money and human resources in a certain line of equipment. For example, an agency has a server farm that is currently 100% from manufacturer or brand "A". They have trained in it, are confident in its performance, bought other hardware for it (like Server Racks). To expect them to move to another manufacturer's equipment is not going to be met with great enthusiasm. In fact, it may drive the agency away from the Seat Management concept altogether.

We should be working to improve the Seat Management program in the COV. I believe that we should pursue modifying the contract in a way that will allow the vendors to provide the equipment they feel is in the best interest of the customer while satisfying the requirements of the agency. Then the COV will have an effective Seat Management Services contract.

Steve Kelliher

Attachment 3

[Worksheet 4 Inventory Worksheet](#) (39k Excel document for download)

Attachment 4

(AGENCY NAME)

TCO BEST PRACTICES WORKSHEET 5

Best Practices Check if All Applicable Best Practices

Technology Improvements - Asset Management

Automated Asset Management

Software Inventory

Hardware Inventory

Automated Software Distribution

Technology Improvements - Systems Management

- Virus Detection and Repair
- Systems Management
- Server Based Client Image Control
- User State Management and Restore

Technology Improvements - Managed PC

- Unattended Power Up
- Client Hardware Event Management
- Low Impact Upgradeability

Technology Improvements - Scalability

- Scalable Architecture
- Low Risk, High Quality Vendor/Provider Selection

Technology Improvements - Business Protection

- Fault Tolerance
- Automated Backup and Restore
- Hardware Physical Security Management

Technology Improvements - Service Desk

- Service Desk Problem Management and Resolution
- Client Remote Control

Process Improvements - User Management

- Enterprise Policy Management
- Locked User Environment
- Data Security Management
- Change Management

Process Improvements - Standardization

- Vendor Standardization
- Platform Standardization

Application Standardization
Centralized and Optimized Procurement

Process Improvements - Practice Management

More Time Spent Planning Versus Implementing
Service Level Tracking and Management
Capacity Planning
TCO Lifecycle Management

People Improvements

User Training
IS Training
IS Staff Highly Motivated
Stable IS Organization

Terms and definitions for TCO Best Practices and contained in Attachment B of the DRAFT TCO Guidelines <http://www.seatmanagement.state.va.us/documents/TCOGuidance.html>